

VINDICATION
OF
THE TRUE SABBATH,
IN TWO PARTS:

PART FIRST,
Narrative of Recent Events;

PART SECOND,
Divine Appointment of the Seventh Day.

By J. W. MORTON,
LATE MISSIONARY OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

NEW-YORK :
PUBLISHED FOR THE AUTHOR,
AT THE SABBATH RECORDER OFFICE,
No. 9 Spruce Street.

PART I.

NARRATIVE OF RECENT EVENTS.

CHAPTER I.

On the 13th of December, 1847, I landed with my family in Port-au-Prince, Haïti, the first Foreign Missionary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States. I began my labors soon afterwards, and continued them, without serious interruption, till the 21st of April, 1849, when a train of circumstances, to which I am about to advert, made it necessary that I should return home.

In the latter part of December, 1848, I was unexpectedly called upon to defend the practice of keeping holy the first day of the week, in place of the seventh. I had been taught from my infancy, that the moral law, "summarily comprehended in the ten commandments," is the only rule of moral conduct; and I had supposed, that it required me and everybody else to keep the "Christian Sabbath" on the first day of the week. On examination, however, I was forced to the conclusion, that the fourth commandment enjoins nothing else than the sanctification of the seventh day. Of course, then, I must either renounce this precept, as a part of the rule of my life, or endeavor to keep holy the seventh day of the week. The former I might not dare to do; the latter I knew I might *attempt*, without offending God, or insulting the majesty of his law.

The question then came up, Is there any scrip-

ture authority for keeping holy the first day? Does God require it? I knew very well, that if God does *not* require it, I could not, as a Reformed Presbyterian, bind my conscience to it. I took up the Bible, resolved on a prayerful and thorough search. I wished to assure myself of the divine authority of the first day, even after I was satisfied that the claims of the seventh are indisputable. But how was it possible to gain this object? Every text to which I was referred for proof seemed to lack the very thing that I most wanted, *a certain testimony to the institution of a Christian Sabbath*. I reasoned thus:—The fact that Christ appeared once or twice to his disciples on the first day of the week, and the fact that the disciples met *once* on that day to break bread, and the fact that Paul commanded the Corinthians and Galatians to ‘lay by them in store’ on that day, as God had prospered them—these facts, with a few others, *might* shed light on the *institution*, if *one single text* could be found, to prove its *existence*. But if this can not be found, they do not touch the question at issue. And how I did long for that *one text*! How I chided with the Apostles for not having made known more clearly what I had determined to be the will of God! Never did Rachel mourn for her children, as I mourned for that *one text*: but, like her, I could not be comforted, because *it was not*!

I was thus driven to the conclusion, that, should I make conscience of keeping holy the first day of the week, I would offer to God a service that he did not require, and could not accept at my hands.

But what was I to do? This was the great *practical* question. Could I, with my then present views, continue to preach the gospel, as I had done before, in that “land of darkness, and of the shadow of death?” Could I teach the children in the school,

as I had taught them before, that God had changed the Sabbath to the first day of the week? Could I proclaim to the benighted heathen, that they might habitually break the fourth commandment with impunity? Could I, as a Protestant missionary, become the partizan of him who thought "to change times and laws,"* by assuring his blinded devotees, that his changes had been made by divine authority? Or, on the other hand, could I carry out my convictions of truth and duty, declaring the whole counsel of God, as I then understood it, and retain, at the same time, my connection with my brethren at home? Would they grant me this privilege, and, if they would, could I accept it?

A little reflection served to convince me, that all these questions must be answered in the negative. It was no small matter, to resolve upon breaking those bonds of ecclesiastical fellowship that had so sweetly bound me to the Reformed Presbyterian Church. A struggle, painful indeed, but not protracted, ensued. I resolved at once to keep the Sabbath in my family, though I feared it would not be honest to make any *public* exhibition of my views, while I continued to minister by the authority of the Synod. I know not what I should have done, had not my change of sentiments brought with it the needed consolations. Whatever were the "vexing thoughts" with which my heart was oppressed, during the first six days of the week, I found invariably, in the quiet retreat of my little family, on the seventh, that "peace of God that passeth all understanding." Yes, Haïti, when the recollection of thy brilliant skies, thy evergreen mountains, and thy

* I believe, that the prophecy in Dan. 7 : 25, refers mainly to the change of Sabbath-time, and Sabbath-law. What time, of divine appointment, it may be asked, was ever changed, except the time of the Sabbath?

sweet clear rivers, shall have ceased to awaken joy in my bosom, the memory of thy Sabbaths shall be "my songs in the house of my pilgrimage!"

CHAPTER II.

Convinced as I was, that something must be done immediately to bring the subject of my change to the attention of the rulers of our church, before the next meeting of Synod, I prepared the following Circular Letter, which I transmitted to more than seventy ministers and elders, in different parts of the United States.

CIRCULAR.

PORT-AU-PRINCE, Haïti, Jan. 17, 1849.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—The mutual relation existing between us, as members of the same Synod, the glory of our common Lord, the interests of our Mission, and a sacred regard for personal character, all require, that the following statement be transmitted to you and my other co-presbyters, with as little delay as possible. If I am not actuated herein by a desire to promote God's glory and the salvation of men, may the Lord rebuke and forgive me, and "let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness!" May the Head of the Church grant to you, and to all the other members of Synod, a disposition to hear, with patience and candor, a narration of my recent experience, in which perhaps you *may* find things both "new and old."

My sentiments in relation to the "Sabbath of the Lord our God," have undergone an important change; to which I now wish to call your attention. Our Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and Testimony, all teach that the first day of the week is, and has been ever since the resurrection of Christ, the Christian Sabbath. This doctrine *alone*, of all those contained in our Standards, though I did believe it till lately, I can no longer receive. As to the *manner* of sanctifying the Sab-

bath, I believe all that you and I have always contended for; but, for the present, I am constrained to believe, that the seventh day of the week is the only weekly Sabbath that God has ever appointed.

My attention was first called to this subject by Rev. W. M. Jones, Missionary of the Baptist Church, who has recently abandoned his earlier views and practice in regard to the Sabbath. He not only argued the question with me at length, but gave me some publications of the American Sabbath Tract Society, which, as they seemed to breathe a spirit of ardent piety and zeal for God's law, I read with attention. Both in my discussion with him, and in the reading of those tracts, I struggled with all my might to convince myself, from the Scriptures, of the divine appointment of the first-day, or Christian Sabbath. But though I did not then doubt it, I was astonished to find how hard it is to prove it.

I searched all the books I could find, bearing on this question, and discovered, what I had never noticed before, that the early French and Genevan Reformers, with Calvin at their head, had taught the abrogation of the fourth commandment, as a ceremonial institution; and that they contended for a Sabbath, or stated day of worship, under the gospel, only as a wise and necessary human arrangement. I found that even Turretin, at a later period, had taught that the fourth commandment is *partly* ceremonial, and that it was necessary to change the Sabbath from the seventh day, in order to put a difference between Jews and Christians. I found also, in my books, quotations, containing similar sentiments, from the celebrated Augsburg Confession. The only authors I could find who had attempted to prove, from the Scriptures, that the Sabbath has been changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, by divine authority, were, Turretin, and the framers of our Standards. These authors appeared to depend *mainly* for proof upon three texts of Scripture:—Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2; and Rev. 1: 10. When I came to examine these texts, I was surprised and mortified, to find that they contain neither the word "Sabbath," nor any other synonymous with it. True, I had always thought that the "Lord's day," Rev. 1: 10, was the first day of the week; but my opponents contended that the terms refer more properly to the seventh, which God styles "my holy day," Is. 58: 13; and when I remembered "his challenging a special propriety in the seventh," I could not well deny it. Moreover, I could not find a single passage asserting that the first is holier than any other day of the week, or that Christians were, in the Apostles' days, in the habit of holding religious meetings *regu-*

larly on that day. Neither could I discover that Christ or his Apostles had ever spoken, directly or indirectly, of keeping a day holy in honor of his resurrection; nor that that event, which is always held up as the occasion of the change of the Sabbath, is even once mentioned in connection with the first day, unless where it is recorded as a historical fact. On the other hand, I observed that Christ and his Apostles *were accustomed* to enter into the synagogue on the seventh day, or Sabbath, for public worship. Luke 4: 16; Acts 17: 2, and elsewhere.

Thus, my dear brother, I saw at this critical moment all Scripture evidence forsaking me, while every inch of ground on which I could set my foot was trembling. It seemed as if the thunders of Sinai were uttering anew their awful threatenings, while the "still small voice" of "Him that dwelt in the bush" was whispering in my ears, "The *seventh* day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. 20: 10. "I am Jehovah, I change not." Mal. 3: 6. "Verily, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. 5: 18. Still I hesitated. For a moment I thought of "going down to Egypt for help." The Fathers, thought I, have fixed the interpretation of these texts in favor of the observance of the first day. But immediately I heard a voice within me, saying, "Would you then observe a holy-day, whose appointment cannot be proved from the Bible, without the aid of human tradition? Could you admit the 'testimony of the Fathers,' to set aside one of the plainest injunctions of the moral law, that law that was written upon tables of stone, 'by the finger of God,' and styled, by way of preëminence, '*the* Testimony?' " No! I replied, with an involuntary shudder; and another flood of Scriptures came rushing in, like "deep waters," to the very soul. "The law of the Lord is perfect." Ps. 19: 7. "Forever. O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." Ps. 119: 89. "Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth." Ps. 119: 142. "All his commandments are sure; they stand fast forever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness." Ps. 111: 7, 8. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." Matt. 5: 17. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Rom. 3: 31. O my brother, "the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword."

You have now my reasons for embracing a doctrine which is confessedly at variance with our Standards. What I entreat of you is, that you will once more examine this subject

for yourself, and see whether those Standards are consistent, on this point, either with the Scriptures, or with themselves.

You perhaps think that I have forsaken the "footsteps of the flock," and that testimony which has been sealed with the blood of martyrs. But tell me candidly, was there ever a martyr who died in defense of the first-day Sabbath? Or, could *you*, my brother, collect from the Scriptures evidence of its divine appointment, clear enough to solace your soul in the midst of the flames? From my inmost soul I pity that Covenanter who may be called to testify, at the stake, to the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. Remember, too, that I am now in the path that was trodden by the saints for more than four thousand years; and it is for *you* to show that that path was ever stopped up, unless by the presumption and inexcusable neglect of man. Truly, I am "compassed about by a great cloud of witnesses." I would follow the example of Jehovah himself, who "blessed the seventh day and sanctified it," and by whom "the Sabbath was made for man;" the example of Adam, Enoch, and Noah; of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the twelve patriarchs; of Moses, Aaron, and those millions of Pilgrim Covenanters who united in its observance in the wilderness; the example of Samuel, David, and a host of other prophets; of Jesus Christ, our Divine Mediator, and "Lord of the Sabbath;" and of the Apostles of our Lord, together with the churches established and watered by them;—in one word, the example of all the saints, from Adam to the last Apostle; all of whom kept and honored the seventh day as "the Sabbath of the Lord their God," and, having finished their course with joy, are entered into that heavenly rest, of which that Sabbath was, and still is, an emblem.

I intend, if the Lord will, to be present at the next meeting of our Synod, and meet my brethren face to face. I expect, of course, nothing less than to be excluded from the privileges of the church; but I rejoice that I have learned to respect the discipline of the Lord's house. I desire, therefore, with a willing heart to approach the altar, and, if the Head of the Church require it, to be "offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith," that God may be glorified in my salvation, and not in my destruction. God forbid, that either prejudice, willful ignorance, passion, or personal resentment, should fan the flames of that altar!

In conclusion, rest assured of my continued and unabated attachment to the cause of the Reformation, in general, and to the interests of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, in particular; and allow me to repeat what I have already intimat-

ed, that with every other doctrine contained in our Standards I am, so far as I understand my profession, entirely satisfied; nor have I abandoned *this one*, but from a firm conviction that it is not taught in God's Word. I know well, that trials sore and many await me. God doth know, that my heart delighteth not in contention; but, my brother, have we not all "entered into a curse, and into an oath, to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses, the servant of God, and to observe and do all the commandments of the Lord our God?" Neh. 10: 29.

Your Brother in Gospel bonds,

J. W. MORTON,

Missionary of the Ref. Presb. Church

CHAPTER III.

On the 21st of April, 1849, I set sail, with my family, from Port-au-Prince, bidding farewell to Haïti and her children, whom perhaps we shall never see again in this vale of tears. We arrived at Boston, all in good health, on the first Sabbath in May.

On the evening of Tuesday, May 22, the Synod was convened in Philadelphia; and the next morning I appeared and took my seat with the other members.

After noon, the same day, Rev. David Scott stated to Synod, that I had made known a change of views in relation to the Sabbath, and moved that a committee of three be appointed to confer with me, and report what farther action should be taken in the case.

While this motion was pending, I stated, in substance, that, as I was alone in a Synod of more than sixty members, without a single man to plead my cause, I thought I had a right to *demand* that the

proceedings should be instituted in strict accordance with the letter of the law. I was here interrupted by the Moderator, who, having informed me that I had no right to dictate to the Court the method of proceeding with its own business, peremptorily ordered me to take my seat. I obeyed, of course, though I could not see what dictation there was in demanding a legal trial, according to the printed rules of Synod. The motion was carried, and the committee appointed.

Next morning, May 24, I had a conference of half an hour with this committee, and at noon another, that lasted about the same time. Their principal object seemed to be, to ascertain whether I was ready to *recant*, and submit to censure for my past errors. I assured them, that while I had not the slightest wish to withdraw from the communion of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, I adhered to every word in my Circular, and must continue to do so, till convinced of error by the infallible scriptures. The committee quoted several texts, and advised me to read several authors, after which our conference was closed.

After noon they presented their report, recommending that the following Libel be preferred against me by Synod:—

LIBEL PREFERRED AGAINST J. W. MORTON.

Whereas, denying that the first day of the week is the day on which the Christian Sabbath should be kept, is a heinous sin and scandal, contrary to the Word of God, and the Profession of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, founded thereon—(*Acts 20: 7*, “And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread,” &c.; *Shorter Catechism*, “From the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, God appointed the seventh day of the week to be the weekly Sabbath, and the first day of the week ever since

to continue to the end of the world, which is the Christian Sabbath."

Yet true it is, that you, Rev. J. W. Morton, are guilty of the scandal above stated, in so far as you, the said J. W. Morton, at Port-au Prince, Haïti, 17th of January, 1849, did publish a Circular, in which you oppugned and denied that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath, which being found relevant, and proved against you, you ought to be proceeded against by the censures of the Lord's House.

A true copy.

By order of the Synod.

[Signed]

JOHN WALLACE, Ass't Clerk.

After some discussion, the above Libel was decided to be relevant, and the Clerk was directed to serve a copy on me, with citation to appear for trial the next day, after noon.

I went to my lodgings that evening with a heavy heart. I was convinced, from the spirit of determined opposition that had been manifested by many of the brethren, when the Libel was under consideration, that the majority had already determined that I should not be permitted to "speak for myself." True, I knew very well that the Apostle Paul had once enjoyed this liberty, through the cool civility of a Roman Governor, and afterwards, through that of a Roman King; but I knew just *as* well, that Felix and Agrippa were heathens, while my brethren are Christians; and that the dignity of a court, composed of "worms of the dust," has been much better understood, since the famous "Diet of Worms," than ever before.

Still, I could not forbear asking myself, Why is there now such bitter opposition to an Institution that was once the delight of both God and man? Why do men hate with such perfect hatred what Jehovah made, and blessed, and sanctified, before

sin had entered into the world? Why should *this* daughter of Innocence be spurned from every door, and loaded with the damning reproach of Judaism, while her twin sister, Marriage, sucks the breasts, and is dandled upon the knees of Orthodoxy? Why should I be ranked with thieves and murderers, for believing that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord my God?" Bitter were the tears that flowed; and more bitter still was the reflection, that "when I wept, that was to my reproach."

I was hedged in round about, and what could I do? I could only exclaim, with the "sweet Singer of Israel," "Let not them that wait on thee, O Lord God of Hosts, be ashamed for my sake; let not those that seek thee be confounded for my sake, O God of Israel. Because for thy sake I have borne reproach; shame hath covered my face. I am become a stranger unto my brethren, and an alien unto my mother's children. For the zeal of thy house hath eaten me up; and the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me." Never shall I forget the sensation experienced while the last sentence was passing through my mind: "*And the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me.*" I know not how often, during that night, I repeated these words, and compared them with the exhortation of the Apostle: "Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach." These were the comforts, that, "in the multitude of my thoughts within me," then delighted my soul. I was about to go forth "without the camp;" and it was indeed refreshing, in that hour of trial, to believe, that I was bearing a portion of the same burden that had once bowed down the 'Man of Sorrows.'

CHAPTER IV.

My trial came on after noon, May 25th. The following extract from the published Minutes of Synod is, I believe, a correct, and sufficiently full, account of the final issue; only it makes no mention of the fact that I protested against the proceedings, and appealed to the head of the Church, for reasons to be given in afterwards. Why this fact was not recorded, I have not been able to ascertain.

EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF SYNOD.

Order of the day, viz., the case of Mr. Morton, called for. The libel was then read by the Clerk; when Mr. Morton having, in reply to the Moderator, answered that he was prepared for trial, the substance of the libel was again stated in his hearing. Mr. Morton was then called upon, according to the rule provided for in such cases, either to confess the charge or put himself upon his trial. Mr. Morton in return acknowledged that he had denied that the day commonly called the Christian Sabbath is so by Divine appointment, and then proceeded to plead the irrelevancy of the charge by endeavoring to prove the perpetuity of the law for the observance of the seventh day. While so doing, he was arrested by the Moderator, who informed him that the charge contained in the libel was such that Mr. Morton could only prove its irrelevancy to censure by proving that the appropriation of the first day of the week, known as the Christian Sabbath, to secular employments, or teaching so to do, is not relevant to censure, which attempt the Moderator would consider disorderly, and would not allow.

From this decision J. M. Willson appealed, when the Moderator's decision was unanimously sustained. Upon this Mr. Morton declined the authority of the court.

Resolved, That Mr. Morton's appointment as missionary to Haïti be revoked.

Resolved, That inasmuch as Mr. Morton has now publicly declined the authority of this court, he be suspended from the

exercise of the Christian ministry, and from the privileges of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

The Moderator then publicly pronounced the sentence of suspension on Mr. Morton, agreeably to the above resolution

Not long afterwards I presented to the Moderator the following Reasons of Protest and Appeal, with a request that he would allow them to be laid before the court, which he utterly refused to do.

REASONS OF PROTEST AND APPEAL.

I do respectfully protest against the action of Synod in my case, on the 24th of the present month, and appeal therefrom to the Lord Jesus Christ, the King and Head of the Church, for the following reasons :—

1st. Because I was not allowed to prove the irrelevancy of the charge made against me, by an appeal to the Bible, “the only rule of faith and manners.”

2nd. Because I believe that the statements, on the subject of the Sabbath, set forth in our subordinate standards, are inconsistent with one another, and in part contrary to the Word of God : yet it was by these unscriptural portions, that I was tried and condemned

Brethren, I entertain no hard feelings towards you. My daily prayer to God is, that you may be saved, and led into all truth. I did hope that you would hear and consider the claims of the Lord’s holy Sabbath, when presented in a mild and affectionate manner. But either I have failed to present the question with sufficient tenderness, or you have determined to avoid all discussion in regard to it.

It grieves me to the soul to bid you farewell. Both God and man will bear witness, in the day of final reckoning, that you have trampled down, by the resistless force of an overwhelming majority, one who was endeavoring with both hands to hold up the standard of the great Covenant God of our fathers. But though for the present cast down, I am not dismayed. The Sabbath of the Lord God is a richer treasure than the richest you can either give or take away. “Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy ; when I fall, I shall arise ; when I sit in darkness, the Lord will be a light unto me. I will bear the indignation of the Lord, because I have sinned against him, until he plead my cause, and execute judgment

for me ; he will bring me forth to the light, and I shall behold his righteousness."

Brethren, I shall meet you before the judgment seat of Christ, on that day when he shall come "with ten thousand of his saints." "Behold, he cometh with clouds ; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him ; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, amen."

J. W. MORTON.

PHILADELPHIA, MAY 29th, 1849.

REFLECTIONS.

I did believe, and believe yet, that, had I been sustained by twenty ministers and as many congregations, I should have had leave to defend myself to my heart's content. But it was very evident to the Synod, that I stood alone. They knew that I could do them no harm, by fomenting discord ; and—may I not add?—they knew that I was not the man to be found employed in such a work. The only loss they could sustain, in cutting me off, with all my adherents, was that of two adults and as many little children. Indeed, many of the members *seemed* to regret the *trouble* far more than the *necessity* of executing the law ; and one aged father has remarked to me since, that till then he never witnessed a trial, before a church court, in which *there was not one atom of mercy*.

Now, is there not a reason for all this ? Unquestionably there is. The loose and unpresbyterial doctrine, that a majority has a right to determine what *is*, and what *is not* truth, and that the greater the majority in favor of any dogma, the more firmly its truth is established, has leavened, sadly and extensively, even the Reformed Presbyterian Church. This is the reason why one who represents a lean minority cannot be heard, even in defense of ecclesiastical life. The majority have said, that the first day is the Sabbath, and who dare call in question

the assertion? A man may be denounced as a covenant-breaker; yet, because he belongs to a small minority, he may not attempt to prove his innocence of the crime. Thus the right of the minority to vindicate themselves from the Scriptures, in defense of which many of the old Covenanters bled, is practically denied by their descendants. "O Lord, how long!"

Brethren, are you really so wedded to this *majority principle*? Know, then, that *God is a majority*; and that those that are with *me* are more than those that are with *you*. God's testimony is worth more than that of all men. What though millions *have* affirmed, that the seventh day is not the Sabbath? *He* hath left us this imperishable testimony: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." And this is the testimony of the *greatest majority* that ever gave utterance to truth. But God hath not left himself without other witnesses. Where are those myriads of angels who were present when "the Sabbath was made for man?" Where are those "morning stars" who "sang together," and those "sons of God" who "shouted for joy," when our Father "laid the foundations of the earth?" They are not *now* present with us, 't is true, to bear their testimony; but they *will be* present, when you and I shall appear before the judgment seat of Christ, to hear the decision of this controversy. And do you think that you will then dare, on the authority of what is said in Acts 20: 7, to lift up your hands, and swear "by Him that liveth forever and ever," that the Sabbath has been "changed into the first day of the week"—and that, too, in presence of those who saw the foundations of the ancient Sabbath, like those of the earth itself, laid and balanced upon God's eternal decree, and inwrought with the very stones of "the ever-

lasting hills?" No! No!! The Sabbath was one of those *pillars* of the ancient earth, which Christ, the Mediator, seized with the hand of his omnipotence, and bare up, when "the earth and all its inhabitants" were sinking into nothing. I repeat it—and who dare gainsay it?—the Lord of Hosts is an overwhelming *majority*!

But this is not all. There is, indeed, no *greater* witness than these; but there is *other* witness. Look into your own hearts, ye children of God, redeemed by the blood of the Lamb, and you will find recorded there: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord; I will put *my laws* into their mind, and write them in their hearts." Here there is not the least hint of any exception. The same moral law that was written "with the finger of God," on tables of stone, is now written "by the Spirit of the living God," on the fleshly tables of *your* hearts. Yes, brethren, turn your eyes inward, and you will read, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." If you say, We have sought this law, but find it not—O brethren, you have not "sought it carefully with tears." It is hidden among the rubbish, and you will never find it, till that be removed. But I speak what I do know, when I assure you, that it *is* recorded there; and in the day of the Lord Jesus, if not sooner, you will find it there, to your unspeakable joy and satisfaction. O Lord, "open thou our eyes, that we may behold wondrous things out of thy law."

PART II.

DIVINE APPOINTMENT OF THE SEVENTH DAY

INTRODUCTION.

The following pages, containing a brief discussion of a small but intensely interesting portion of the Sabbath controversy, are designed especially for the perusal of those Christians, styled orthodox, who do not keep holy the seventh day of the week.

Dear brethren, this is a subject of fearful importance. If the views herein advocated are correct, *you* are guilty both of breaking and of teaching men to break one of God's holy commandments; if they are incorrect, I am no less guilty. Need I say any thing more to convince you that you ought to give this subject a candid and prayerful examination? "Ye are the light of the world;" take heed, brethren, that your light be not darkness! You know—you cannot but know—that there is much, *very much*, said in the Bible about the Sabbath, and that men are very often commanded to keep it holy. You must know, also, that God has said in the fourth commandment, "The *seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work;" and that, for more than four thousand years, no other day of the week ever claimed to be holy. Moreover, you cannot but know, if you have read the Bible carefully, that the first day of the week, which you call "the Christian Sabbath," is *very seldom* mentioned; that there are only six passages in which

the name occurs, and that four of these may be viewed as one, being the records of the same events, by different Evangelists; and how can you have failed to notice the fact, that in not one of these six passages are we, or any of our fellow-creatures, commanded to keep the first day holy? Yet you are convinced that the first day of the week is *the very Sabbath-day*, while among all those Scripture commands, before referred to, you find nothing to sustain the claims of the seventh. O brethren, you “put darkness for light, and light for darkness.” Let us bow before the mercy-seat of Him who is the Author of life and light, and, renewing our personal covenant with him, plead his precious promise: “If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.”

I shall endeavor, in the following pages, to establish the truth of the following proposition:—

That the seventh day of the week is the only weekly Sabbath of God's appointment.

I intend to present and enforce *four reasons* for believing this proposition:—

First—Because the original Sabbath law requires the sanctification of no other day.

Second—Because Adam and all his posterity have solemnly covenanted to keep holy the seventh day.

Third—Because Christ and his Apostles honored this day; and did not intimate that it would ever cease to be the Sabbath, but the contrary.

Fourth—Because God has never blessed and sanctified any day of the week but the seventh.

As the discussion is limited by design to a nar-

row range, you will please to bear in mind, that the following points are assumed as true :—

First—The Sabbath was instituted before the fall of man.

Second—Adam represented all his posterity in the covenant of works.

Third—The Sabbath law is perpetual, “binding all men in all ages.”

Fourth—The seventh day was the *only* weekly Sabbath for at least four thousand years.

Lord, sanctify us by thy truth. May the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, whom thou sendest in the name of thy Son our Lord, abide in us and preside in this controversy. May he teach us all things, and bring all things to our remembrance. May all bitterness, and wrath, and malice, and evil-speaking, be far from us; and may we love one another with pure hearts fervently—for Christ’s sake. Amen.

CHAPTER 1.

PROPOSITION.

That the seventh day of the week is the only weekly sabbath of God’s appointment.

First Reason.

My first reason for believing this proposition is, That the original Sabbath law, referred to in Genesis 2 : 2, 3, and embodied in Exodus 20 : 8—11, requires the sanctification of no other day.

Genesis 2 : 2, 3.—“And on the seventh day (*on day the seventh*) God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day (*on day the seventh*) from all his

work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh DAY (*the day the seventh,*) and sanctified it: because that in IT he had rested from all his work which God created and made."

Exodus 20: 8, 11.—"Remember the Sabbath-DAY. (*the day of the rest, or Sabbath*) to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day (*day the seventh*) is the Sabbath (*rest*) of the Lord thy God: *in it* thou shalt not do any manner of work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that *is* within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them *is*, and rested the seventh day (*on day the seventh*;) wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-DAY (*the day of the rest, or Sabbath,*) and hallowed it."

The only object, direct or indirect, of this commandment, is "*the day.*" What are we commanded to remember? "The day." What are we required to keep holy? "The day." What did the Lord bless and hallow? "The day." In what are we forbidden to work? In "the day." Now let us inquire—

1. What day? *Not* the day of Adam's fall; nor the day Noah went into the ark; nor the day of the overthrow of Sodom; nor the day of the Exodus; nor the day of the Provocation; nor the day of the removal of the ark; nor the day of Christ's birth; nor the day of his crucifixion; nor the day of his resurrection; nor the day of his ascension; nor the day of judgment. It may be, and certainly is, proper, that we should remember all these; but we are not told to do so in this commandment. Neither is it some one day of the week, but no one in particular; for how could we remember "*the day,*" that is no day in particular?—how could we keep holy "*the day*" that has not been specified?—and how could we say that God had blessed and hallowed "*the day,*" that was no one day more than another? What day, then? God says, Remember *the Sabbath-day, or the day of the Sabbath*; Keep holy *the*

day of the Sabbath; The Lord blessed and hallowed *the day of the Sabbath*. He also says, *The seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God ; *in it* thou shalt not do any work. This day, therefore, is "the seventh day," or "the day of the Sabbath."

2. What Sabbath? Not "*a Sabbath*," or any Sabbath that man may invent, or that God may hereafter keep ; for that would be "some Sabbath," but no one in particular. Not some institution yet undetermined, that God may require man to observe weekly ; for the command is not, "Remember the Sabbath institution," but, "Remember the *day* of the Sabbath ;" not, "Keep holy the Sabbath institution," but, "Keep holy the *day* of the Sabbath." The Lord did not bless and hallow "the Sabbath institution," but "the *day* of the Sabbath." We are not forbidden to do work in "the Sabbath institution," but in "the *seventh day*." In fact, the phrase "the Sabbath," in this commandment, means neither more nor less than "the rest." It is not *here* the name of any institution at all, though it is often thus used in other parts of the Bible. Hence, this Sabbath is "the Sabbath or rest of the Lord thy God."

3. Which day of the week is "the day of the Sabbath?" No other than that day on which the Lord rested ; for the command refers to God's Sabbath. On which day of the week did he rest ? "And he rested on the seventh day." Genesis 2 : 2. Therefore, "the day of the Sabbath" is the same day of the week on which God rested from the work of creation ; and as he rested on the seventh day of the first week, and on no other, the seventh and no other day of every other week must be the only "day of the Sabbath."

Let it be particularly observed, that God does not say, Remember the Sabbath, or, Remember the Sab

batic institution, though this is necessarily implied in the command ; but, Remember “the day of the Sabbath”—the day on which I have ordained that the Sabbatic institution be observed. As if he had said, There is little danger, *comparatively*, that you will forget the fact of my having kept Sabbath ; nor is it likely that you will altogether neglect to observe *some day* of rest from your arduous toils, for you will be driven to this by the ever returning demands of your exhausted bodies ; but you are, and always will be, in especial danger of forgetting the proper day of the week for honoring me in my own institution. Satan, who takes infinite delight in all kinds of “will-worship,” while he hates with a perfect hatred every act of strict obedience to my law, will do all he can to persuade you that some other day will do just as well, or even better. Remember, therefore, the day of my Sabbath, and keep the same day holy in every week ; for—mark the reason—I have myself rested on the seventh day, and on that account I have blessed and sanctified that and no other day of the week, that you may observe it, and keep it holy, not because it is in itself better than any other day, but because I have blessed and sanctified it.

But you say that the phrase, “the Sabbath-day,” or “the day of the Sabbath,” does not mean any particular day, but “one day in seven,” or some one of the days of the week. You alledge that “the day of the Sabbath,” like “the Pope of Rome,” “the Emperor of Russia,” or “the King of Denmark,” is a generic term, alike applicable to all the members of the same class. The phrase, “the Emperor of Russia,” you say, refers alike to Peter, to Alexander, and to Nicholas, though only one of them could be Emperor at any given time ; so “the day of the Sabbath” refers alike to the seventh and to

the first day of the week, though there never was but one Sabbath at any one time. This is a very ingenious and plausible method of evading the force of the Divine testimony ; but, as the reasoning by which it is sustained appears to be entirely sophistical, I cannot but look upon the whole thing as a fabrication. I believe that any man, possessing the requisite qualifications, *may* become “ Emperor of Russia,” but deny that any day but one *can* be the day of God’s Sabbath, inasmuch as God had never kept, at that time, but one Sabbath, and that occupied only one day. There is only one day of American Independence ; only one day of the Resurrection of Christ ; only one day of the birth of any one man ; and only one day of Judgment. And why ? Because American Independence was declared on but one day ; Christ rose on but one day ; the same man cannot be born on two different days ; and God hath appointed only one day in which he will judge the world. Now, on the same principle, there can be but one “ day of the Sabbath ” of the Lord our God. If I should say that the day of Christ’s Resurrection is not any particular day of the week, but only “ one day in seven,” you would not hesitate to call me a fool, while my ignorance would excite your deepest sympathy ; but when *you* say that “ the day of the Sabbath ” does not mean that particular day on which the Lord’s Sabbath occurred, but only “ one day in seven,” you expect me to receive your assertion as the infallible teaching of superior wisdom. I cannot, however, so receive it, for the following reasons :—

1. If God had meant “ one day in seven,” he would have said so. His first and great design, in writing his law on tables of stone, was to be understood by his creatures ; but, for more than two thousand years after he gave the law, no human being

ever suspected that "the day of the Sabbath" meant anything else than the seventh day of the week, because it was commonly known that that day alone was in reality "the day of the Sabbath." Indeed, this "one-day-in-seven" doctrine is known to have been invented within a few hundred years, with the pious design of accounting for a change of Sabbath, without the necessity of repealing a portion of the moral law. It is matter of great surprise, that those pious theologians, who first substituted "one day in seven" for "the day of the Sabbath," did not shudder at the thought of presuming to mend the language of the Holy Ghost. "The words of the Lord are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." Ps. 12: 6. Brethren, are you prepared to enter into judgment, and answer for the liberties you have taken with God's word? In substituting the vague and indefinite expression, "one day in seven," for the definite and unequivocal terms, "the Sabbath-day," and "the seventh day," you have as truly taken "away from the words of the prophecy of this book," as if you had blotted the fourth commandment from the Decalogue; while your leading object has been, to make way for the introduction of a new command that, for aught the Scriptures teach, it never entered into the heart of the Almighty to put into his law. "A faithful witness will not lie," and when the world asks, Which day of the seven hath God appointed to be the weekly Sabbath? God expects that you, as faithful witnesses, will not only "not lie," but that you will not equivocate, or give with the gospel trumpet "an uncertain sound." He does not expect that you will quote a text from the Acts of the Apostles, that says not one word about Sabbath-keeping, to prove that the fourth commandment enjoins the keeping holy of "one day in seven," but of "no day in particular."

2. God never blessed "one day in seven," without blessing a particular day. He either blessed some definite object, or nothing. You *may* say, indeed, without falsehood, that God blessed "one day in seven;" but if you mean that this act of blessing did not terminate on any particular day, you ought to know, that you are asserting what is naturally impossible. As well might you say of a band of robbers, that they had killed "one man in seven," while in reality they had killed no man in particular. No, brethren, yourselves know very well, that God had not blessed and sanctified any day but *the seventh of the seven*, prior to the giving of the written law. You know, that if God blessed any day of the week at all, it was a definite day, distinct from all the other days of the week. But this commandment says, that "the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day." Therefore the Sabbath-day must be a particular day of the week. Therefore "the Sabbath-day" is not "one day in seven," or an indefinite seventh part of time. Therefore it is not "one day in seven" that we are required to remember, and keep holy, and in which we are forbidden to do any work; but "the seventh day" of the week, which was then, is now, and will be till the end of time, "the day of the Sabbath" of the Lord our God.

3. No day of the week but the seventh was ever called "the day of the Sabbath," either by God or man, till long since the death of the last inspired writer. Search both Testaments through and through, and you will find no other day called "*the Sabbath*," or even "*a Sabbath*," except the ceremonial Sabbaths, with which, of course, we have nothing to do in this controversy. And long after the close of the canon of inspiration, the seventh day, and no other, was still called "the Sabbath." If you can prove that any one man, among the millions

of Adam's children, from the beginning of the world till the *rise of Anti-Christ*, ever called the first day of the week "*the Sabbath*," you will shed a light upon this controversy, for which a host of able writers have searched in vain.

But, farther; the first day of the week was not observed by any of the children of men, *as a Sabbath*, for three hundred years after the birth of Christ. Do you ask proof? I refer you to Theodore de Beza, who plainly says so. If you are not satisfied with the witness, will you have the goodness to prove the affirmative of the proposition?

I infer, therefore, that "the day of the Sabbath," or "the Sabbath-day," is the proper name of the seventh day of the week, as much so as "the day of Saturn;" and that to attach this proper name *now* to some other day of the week, and to affirm that God meant that other day, as much as he did the seventh, when he wrote the law on tables of stone, is as unreasonable as it is impious. If you say, that when God speaks of "the Sabbath-day," he means "one day in seven, but no day in particular," you are as far from the truth as if you said that, when he speaks of Moses, he does not mean any particular man, but "some one of the Israelites." Moses *was* one of the Israelites, just as the Sabbath-day *is* one day in seven. But when God says Moses, he means Moses the son of Amram; and when he says "the Sabbath-day," he means the seventh day of the week. You *may* give different names to the same object, without interfering with its identity; but to apply the same name to two different objects, and then to affirm that these two objects are identically the same, so that what is predicated of the one must be true of the other, is as though a navigator should discover an island in the Southern Ocean, and call it "England," and then affirm that the late

work of Mr. Macaulay, entitled "The History of England," is a veritable and authentic history of his newly-discovered empire. Which would you wonder at most, the stupidity or the effrontery of that navigator?

I cannot close this chapter without reminding you that, in attempting to refute the above reasoning, the main thing you will have to show is, that "the Sabbath-day," or "the day of the Sabbath," is an indefinite or general expression, applicable alike to at least two different days of the week, and that it is used indefinitely in this commandment. If it has been proved, that "the day of the Sabbath" refers, and can refer, *only* to the seventh day of the week, then it is true, and will remain forever true, that the original Sabbath law requires the sanctification of no other day. This is the truth which I undertook to exhibit in this chapter, and is my first reason for believing the proposition under consideration.

CHAPTER II.

Second Reason.

My second reason for believing this proposition is, That Adam and all his posterity have solemnly covenanted to keep holy the seventh day.

Genesis 2: 15—17—"And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the Garden of Eden, to dress it, and to keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying. Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

Romans 5: 12, 19—"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered

into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one many shall be made righteous."

Galatians 3: 10—"For as many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them."

On these passages it may be remarked—

1. "God gave to Adam a law, as a covenant of works, by which he bound him, *and all his posterity*, to personal, exact, *entire*, and *perpetual* obedience."

2. "This law, after his fall, continued to be a *perfect rule of righteousness*; and, *as such*, was delivered by God upon Mount Sinai in ten commandments, and written in two tables." Therefore, the fourth commandment and the Sabbath law of the covenant of works are *one and the same law*; and all believers in Christ are now bound by this law, *as a rule of life*, to remember and keep holy the *same Sabbath-day* that Adam and all his posterity covenanted to remember and keep holy.

3. You admit that Adam, *and all his posterity*, pledged themselves to keep holy the seventh day of every week, *and no other*. Therefore, *we* are all born under a solemn obligation, our own obligation in Adam, to keep holy that same seventh day of every week as long as we remain on earth: "*Neither doth Christ in the gospel any way dissolve but much strengthen this obligation.*"

4. It is now too late to alter the covenant of works, by substituting some other day of the week for the seventh, for the following reasons:—

First—Because the whole transaction was finished, in the person of our representative, nearly six thousand years ago. The covenant was made, the obligation assumed, the deed of transgression con-

summated, the curse pronounced, and the bitter *death* experienced, in *kind*, though not *in degree*, and all this before the first revelation of the mercy of God in Christ. We are, therefore, all of us, the very moment we are born, accursed of God, for not having kept holy the seventh day of the week, according to our covenant. And all who are not redeemed therefrom by Christ, remain forever under this curse. From which it is plain, that to substitute some other day for the seventh, since the fall of man, is as impossible as it would be to substitute *some other tree* for the "tree of knowledge." To all who admit that God made a covenant of works with all mankind *in Adam*, these truths ought to be self-evident. Brethren, *we* acknowledge that we are all guilty before God of having eaten of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, while we disclaim *any guilt whatever* in regard to the fruit of every other tree ; so are we guilty of violating the rest of the seventh day of the week, while we are not by nature guilty of polluting any other day.

Second—Because such substitution would destroy an integral part of the moral law. The law written on the heart of man said nothing about keeping holy any other day than the seventh ; for all admit that, had Adam not fallen, there never would have been any other holy day. If, then, this law does *not now* require the sanctification of the seventh day, *the fourth commandment must have been annihilated* ; and if another day is *now* the Sabbath, a new commandment, requiring *for a new reason* the sanctification of a different day, must have been substituted in its place. But this new law can be *no part of the moral law*, because it was *not written on man's heart*, nor did any human being know of its existence till thousands of God's people had been taken home to glory. God gave to Adam *free permission* to labor and do

work on every day but the seventh, and he, as a free moral agent, accepted the proffered boon. Therefore, to labor on any one of the first six days of the week is, under the covenant of works, *as innocent in itself* as to pray to the Creator of the Universe. It is as much a natural and inalienable right, as “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” Now, if there is a law that requires the keeping holy of some other day, it must have its origin in the new-covenant grace of God; and if that other day, and not the seventh, is *now* the Sabbath, men are *now* no more under a *natural* obligation to keep a Sabbath than to be baptized, or to celebrate the Lord’s Supper. The obligation to keep it *must*, on your principle, grow out of their new-covenant relation to God in Christ.

Let us now look for a moment at the consequences flowing from the doctrine, that some other day—the first, for example—has been substituted for the seventh. “Try the spirits.” “By their fruits ye shall know them.”

1. If this doctrine be true, the doctrine *that Adam represented all his posterity, must be false*; for, if Adam covenanted, as you admit he did, to keep holy the seventh day of every week, and *we* are not bound to do so, he certainly did not represent us, neither in that nor in any other part of the covenant; for, if we did not promise in Adam to keep holy the Sabbath-day, we did not promise to keep any thing else.

2. If this doctrine be true, *there is now no such thing as original sin*. This follows as a matter of course; for, if Adam did not represent us, we are not *born sinners*. The fact might be proved in another way, but this is enough.

3. If this doctrine be true, and the law of the new Sabbath bind “all men,” as you say it does, it must

bind *the heathen*, who are a part of "all men." But if there is a new Sabbath instituted, it can only be made known through the written word of God, of which the heathen *can know nothing*. This new Sabbath has never been made known to them, nor to any of their ancestors. Nevertheless, you say that they are bound to observe it, *according to the written word*, and that they shall be punished to all eternity for breaking it; which is contrary to the teaching of the Apostle, (Rom. 2: 12,) that the heathen shall be judged and condemned, not by the written word, but by *the law of nature*, which you know can reveal no Sabbath but that of the seventh day; for Adam, who understood the law of nature better than any other mere man, never thought of keeping holy any other day. And, moreover, the heathen have, on your principle, only nine commandments to obey or disobey; for they are under the law of nature, which says, "Keep holy the seventh day:" but you say that God does not *now* require this: therefore they are released from the obligation. And, what is stranger still, the heathen have no means of knowing that to keep the seventh day *is a work of supererogation*. These are *a few* of the consequences of your doctrine of a change of Sabbath. What must be the character of that tree which yields such fruits!

Let us now attend for a moment to your objections.

Do you say, Those who believe in Christ are redeemed, not only from the curse of the Sabbath law, but also from the obligation to obey it in future? If so, who can tell but we are redeemed from *every other* moral obligation?

Or, do you alledge, that Christ makes a new contract with the sinner, saying, If you keep holy the first day, I will release you from the obligation to

sanctify the seventh ? “ Do we then make void the law through faith ? God forbid : yea, we establish the law.” Rom. 3 : 31. But perhaps you say, To change the Sabbath from one day to another is not to make void the law ;” it is only to vary its application. I reply, It *is* to make void, to *annul*, to *annihilate*, one tenth part of that law that God wrote on Adam’s heart ; for, as has been shown already, that law required him to keep no day holy but the seventh.

Or, do you plead that, as God *has* substituted the Lord Jesus Christ for the sinner, without violating the moral law, so he *may* have substituted some other day for the seventh ? I reply, The cases are not parallel ; for—

1. The substitution of Christ does not render a change of any part of the law necessary ; but the other does. Christ “ came not to destroy” the law, but to fulfill it ; and in fulfilling it, he honored the seventh day : but the substitution of some other day for the seventh, had it taken place before Christ came, would have released him, as well as us, from the obligation to obey a part of the law of the covenant of works.

2. A change of Sabbath is not, like the substitution of Christ, *necessary* to the salvation of sinners ; for God had saved thousands before this change is alledged to have taken place.

3. The substitution of Christ changes the moral condition *of the church only* ; but the change of Sabbath would affect the moral relations of all men ; for the Sabbath was made, not for the church, but “ for man.”

4. The evangelical doctrine of the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ, of itself, proves the impossibility of a change of Sabbath. All evangelical Christians hold, that believers are delivered, through

Christ, from the *curse* of the law—the law of the covenant of works—but *not from the obligation to obey it*. If, therefore, that law required *Adam and his posterity* to keep holy the seventh day of the week, Christ has never redeemed them from the obligation to render “*exact obedience*,” in this particular, as in every other.

Do you plead, as a last resort, that, as the command not to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge has passed away, so it may be with the law of the seventh-day Sabbath? I reply, The cases are not parallel; for that command never was a part of the moral law. It was never written, either on man’s heart, or on tables of stone; but this was. Besides, the tree of knowledge has been destroyed from the face of the earth, so that to eat of its fruit is now impossible; but the seventh day will continue to return “while the earth remaineth.”

Brethren, you bewilder yourselves and others, by adopting, as a moral axiom, the false principle, that whatever is in its nature positive, is, *for that reason*, changeable. There is no principle more deadly than this. Do you not know, that all our hopes, as Christians, for time and for eternity, are suspended on the *immutability* of that *positive arrangement* between the Father and the Son, which we call the covenant of grace? Are not the decrees of God all *positive*, yet, at the same time, immutable? So, also, the *Sabbath law*, though in its nature positive, has been made unchangeable, by a solemn covenant arrangement, “in which it was impossible for God to lie.” If God had not made the law, requiring the sanctification of the seventh day, an essential part of the covenant of works, your doctrine of a change of Sabbath would not be so preposterous. As it is, how can serious, thinking men, help viewing it as a monstrous and impious absurdity!

CHAPTER III.

Third Reason.

My third reason for believing this proposition is, That Christ and his Apostles honored this day; and did not intimate that it would ever cease to be the Sabbath, but the contrary.

1. Christ honored this day.

Luke 4: 16—"And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and stood up for to read."

Luke 4: 30, 31; (See also Mark 1: 21)—"But he, passing through the midst of them, went his way, and came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught them on the Sabbath-days."

Luke 13: 10—"And he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the Sabbath."

Mark 3: 1, 2—"And he entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there which had a withered hand. And they watched him whether he would heal him on the Sabbath-day."

Mark 6: 2—"And when the Sabbath-day was come, he began to teach in the synagogue."

2. The Apostles honored this day. Read carefully the following passages and their contexts.

Acts 13: 14—"But when they departed from Perga, they came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and sat down."

Acts 13: 44—"And the next Sabbath-day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." (That is, to hear Paul and Barnabas preach.)

Acts 14: 1—"And it came to pass in Iconium, that they Paul and Barnabas) went both together into the synagogue

of the Jews, and so spake, that a great multitude, both of the Jews, and also of the Greeks, believed."

Acts 16: 23—"And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither."

Acts 17: 2—"And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures."

Acts 18: 4—"And he (Paul) reasoned in the synagogues every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks."

Brethren, if you produce one solitary apostolic example of unnecessary labor performed on the seventh day, I will at once give up the argument in its favor.

3. Neither Christ nor his Apostles intimated that the seventh day would cease to be the Sabbath.

This being a negative assertion, I am not bound to prove it, of course. If you assert that they did, I demand the proof of it.

4. Christ has very plainly intimated the contrary.

Matthew 24: 20—"But pray ye that your flight be not in winter, neither on the Sabbath-day."

The "flight" here spoken of was to take place about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem; and the Saviour admonishes his disciples to pray that it might not happen on the Sabbath-day. Now, if he knew that the Sabbath-day would be changed into the "Lord's day," forty years before the event he had just alluded to, why did he speak of it as a thing that would be then in existence? Many are the efforts that have been made to evade the force of the argument from this text; but they are all unavailing.

Matthew 5: 17, 19—"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass,

one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

It is almost universally admitted, that the Saviour, in these verses, refers principally to the ten commandments, which were then, as now, called, by way of preëminence, "*the law*." That he may have referred also to the ceremonial code, which he came to fulfill, we do not deny. But this has nothing to do with our present purpose.

That the fourth commandment enjoins the sanctification of the seventh day of the week, no man in his senses denies. But you alledge that that part of it has been taken away, so that it does not now bind us.

Now, in making this assertion, you either affirm what is positively denied in the above quotation, or you make this commandment at least *partly* ceremonial, and *peculiar to the Jews*. This will appear evident from the following considerations :—

First—The command to keep holy the seventh day of the week, is far more than "one jot or one tittle" of this law. It could be no less, but it is much more. Indeed, it is very certain, that Adam considered it a very important part of the law; and so did Christ, when he uttered these words, for he kept the Sabbath as devoutly as Adam ever did.

Second—Heaven and earth have not yet passed away; but you say that this seventh-day law has; therefore, much more than "one jot or one tittle" has passed from the law—which is contrary to Christ's assertion.

Third—If you say that Christ has fulfilled this law, and so taken it away, you make it a ceremony, like the Passover. You know that Christ never ful-

filled, *so as to take away*, any law but those that he “nailed to his cross,” and that he never nailed to his cross any law that bindeth “all men in all ages.” If, then, the law requiring the sanctification of the seventh day of the week has been nailed to the cross of Christ, it must have been a ceremony peculiar to the Jews, and to which the Gentiles were never bound. Was Adam a Jew? Was Enoch a Jew? Were Noah and his sons Jews? But these all kept the seventh day, *and no other*.*

Brethren, it has been proved, in the first chapter of this treatise, that the fourth commandment requires simply the observance of the seventh day of the week. I will not repeat what is there said. I now ask you, as candid inquirers after truth, to place this commandment and our Saviour’s declarations, quoted above, side by side, and see if *your* conduct is not at war with both. You neglect the only day that God’s law requires you to remember, while Christ assures you, in the most solemn manner, that “one jot or one tittle” shall in no wise pass from the law, “till heaven and earth pass,” or till time shall be no more.

* Some of my Reformed Presbyterian brethren appear to be as far from believing “the whole doctrine of the Westminster Confession of Faith” as myself, only they are a little more guarded in the choice of words. That Confession says, (ch. 21, sec. 7,) “—so, in his word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, *binding all men in all ages*, he hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto him.” But Rev. Andrew Stephenson, in a letter to me, speaking of the seventh-day Sabbath, styles it, “This relic of Judaism;” and Rev. James Milligan, in a recent letter, asks me, “Why has not the Lord’s day as good a right to take the place of the seventh day, as the Lord’s Supper has to take the place of the Passover?” Query—Are Reformed Presbyterians, who hold such sentiments, any better qualified to judge their brethren for Sabbath-breaking, than I would be to judge them for a like offense?

There is a little commandment in that law that says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God ; in it thou shalt not do any work." Christ says, that whosoever doeth and teacheth this commandment "shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." But this hath been my only crime. God knows, and you know, that the only thing I have done to offend you is, that I endeavor to refrain from doing work on the seventh day, and to "teach men so." Yet for this I am declared to be the "least in the kingdom of heaven," and no longer worthy of a seat at the table of Him who said, that "one jot or one tittle" should *in no wise* pass from the law.

Blessed be God ! it is a light thing to be judged of man's judgment. But I confess that sometimes my blood runs cold, when I think of this solemn declaration of the same "Lord of the Sabbath," (John 12: 48,) "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him : the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." "Never man spake like this man." O, brethren, are you ready for that awful judgment day ? Nothing but God's *word* will avail you there. If you are determined to go on, appropriating the seventh day to secular purposes, and "teaching men so," I cannot help it ; but I call heaven and earth to witness, that, in regard to every reader of these pages, my skirts are henceforth clear. On your own souls will rest the responsibility of rejecting these solemn words of Christ. And you who are ministers—how will you answer for the wanderings of those lambs of Christ's fold, whom you are leading into strange pastures ?

CHAPTER IV.

Fourth Reason.

My fourth reason for believing this proposition is, That God has never blessed and sanctified any day of the week but the seventh.

In sustaining this reason, as I occupy negative ground, I shall simply defend it against your usual scripture arguments in defense of your favorite doctrine, that God blessed and sanctified the first day of the week, in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ.

In arguing this doctrine, you do not pretend to offer *positive*, but only *inferential* proof. You quote certain texts, and say, Hence we infer that the first day of the week is the Sabbath. Now, as there are many possible, and even plausible, inferences, that are not necessarily true, I intend to be governed, in the examination of your scripture proofs, by the following rule of interpretation:—

“The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man’s salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in scripture, or *by good and necessary consequence* may be deduced from scripture.”

Brethren, I intend, with God’s help, to show that, according to the above rule, which you admit to be correct, all your inferences in favor of a first-day Sabbath are *unnecessary*, and some of them wholly inadmissible.

YOUR FIRST PROOF.

Hebrews 4: 9, 10—“There remaineth, therefore, a rest (sabbatism) to the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his.”

Your premises consist of four assertions :—First, That the rest, or sabbatism, that remaineth, is something different from the ancient Sabbath. Second, That the person who “hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his,” is the Lord Jesus Christ. These two assertions I most cheerfully admit. Third, That Christ entered into his rest on the day of his resurrection. Fourth, That the sabbatism of God’s people is enjoyed in this life. These last two assertions I utterly deny.

Your inference is, That the first day of every week, that being the day of the week on which Christ rose, is the sabbatism of God’s people. Of course, if I prove that the last two assertions are false, your inference will be shown to be inadmissible.

I assert, then,—

1. That Christ did *not* “enter into his rest” on the day of his resurrection; for the following reasons :—First, Because the Scriptures do not say so. Second, Because this earth is not the place of his rest. He was, to the last day he spent here, “a pilgrim and a stranger in the earth,” and had not therein “where to lay his head.” But his resurrection took place on earth, and he continued on earth for “forty days” afterwards. Third, Because the scriptures plainly teach, that the Mediator *did* “enter into his rest,” when he “sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.” Heb. 1: 3. “Arise, O Lord, into thy rest; thou and the ark of thy strength.” Ps. 132: 2. This was the prayer of David and the congregation of Israel, when they removed the ark from the house of Obed-Edom to the place “that David had pitched for it.” When Solomon and the Elders of Israel brought up the ark from the city of David, and placed it in the holy of holies, in the temple “made with hands,” they pray

ed in like manner, "Now therefore arise, O Lord God, into thy resting-place, thou, and the ark of thy strength." 2 Chron. 6 : 41. Now the ark was a type of Christ, while "heaven itself" is the true "holy of holies," "whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made a high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." Heb. 6 : 20. If, then, the ark entered into its rest, when it was placed in the holy of holies, Jesus Christ, the anti-typical ark, entered into *his* rest when he sat down on the right hand of God, in the anti-typical holy of holies. Fourth, Because the Apostle's great design, in this epistle, was to convince the church, and especially the Hebrews, that Christ, having "by himself purged our sins," as they all admitted he had done, "sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high," (ch. 1 : 3,) as our ever-living Intercessor. Yes, the "one idea," that runs through the whole Epistle, is to illustrate and magnify the doctrine of the glorious intercession of Christ the Mediator, who, "after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God." Do you ask proof? Take, then, the apostle's own assertion, (ch. 8 : 1,) "Now, of the things which we have spoken, this is the sum : We have such a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens ; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man." All that is said in the third and fourth chapters, about the rest of Christ and the sabbatism of the people of God, is included in this summary ; so that it is to Christ's eternal rest in the heavens that the verses under consideration refer. Indeed, we have evidence of this fact, satisfactory enough, in the immediate context, (ch. 3 : 4,) "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest

of our profession, Christ Jesus"—compared with ch. 4 : 14—" Seeing, then, that we have a great High Priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession." Fifth, Because there is not, in this epistle, one solitary reference to the resurrection of Christ, except in the concluding benediction ; but it abounds in references to his ascension and intercession.

2. If I have reasoned correctly above, your assertion, that the sabbatism of God's people is enjoyed in this life, scarcely needs refutation. As Christ entered into his rest, when he received the crown of glory from the Father ; so believers shall enter into his rest, when they " shall be glorified with him." Moreover, as Christ did not enter into his rest on the first day of the week, your inference, that that day is the Sabbath, is not only *unnecessary*, but wholly inadmissible.

Bear in mind also, brethren, that, if Christ did not enter into his rest on the first day of the week, then your great philosophical argument for the first-day Sabbath, founded upon the fact, that the work of redemption is greater than that of creation, vanishes at once into smoke, or, at least, becomes useless for your purpose.

YOUR SECOND PROOF.

Psalm 118 : 22, 24—" The stone which the builders refused is become the head-stone of the corner." " This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it."

Acts 4 : 10, 11—" Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner."

You premise, that " the day which the Lord hath made" is the day of the resurrection of Christ.

Whence you infer, that the first day of the week is the Sabbath.

1. If what you premise were true, the inference does not follow. The prophet does not say, We will rejoice and be glad in the same day of every week ; but, We will rejoice and be glad *in it*, that is, in that day, whatever it may be. Now Christ did not rise on the first day of every week, but on one single day ; and we may very well rejoice and be glad in that one day, without keeping any Sabbath in connection with it. Abraham rejoiced and was glad in the day of Christ ; but he kept no Sabbath in honor of it. So, doubtless, *you* rejoice and are glad in the day of his crucifixion, though you do not celebrate it on any particular day of the week. But—

2. You are evidently mistaken in referring this language of the Psalmist to the resurrection of Christ—for the following reasons :—

First—Because “the day which the Lord hath made” is the same in which Christ went in by the gates of righteousness. Verses 19 and 20. “Open to me the gates of righteousness : I will go into them, and I will praise the Lord. This gate of the Lord, into which the righteous shall enter.” Now, though Christ *did* come up from “the gates of death” on the day of his resurrection, he *did not* formally “enter” by “the gates of righteousness,” till that day when he ascended from Mount Olivet, which was not the first day of the week. His almighty power and eternal Sonship were declared most gloriously on the day of his resurrection ; but it was on the day of his ascension that his mediatorial righteousness was formally approved by the Father ; while it was visibly manifested, in the presence of the universe, that the door of heaven had been opened to all true believers. Then shouted the seraphim,

and all the host of heaven, while the door-posts of the New Jerusalem trembled at the voice, "Arise, O Jehovah, into thy rest, thou, and the ark of thy strength. Let thy priests be clothed with righteousness; and let thy saints shout for joy!" Therefore, this is not the day of Christ's resurrection, but that of his ascension.

Second—Because "the day which the Lord hath made" is the same in which "the stone which the builders refused" became "the head-stone of the corner," (verse 22.) Christ did not become "the head of the corner," till he "sat down on the right hand of God." You assert that he did, and refer to Acts 4: 10, 11, quoted above, as proof. From what the apostle there sets forth, you draw the inference, that, as he was set at nought by the builders, when he was crucified, so he became the head of the corner, when God raised him from the dead. The apostle does not say, however, that this took place on the same day that he rose from the dead; and all that we must *necessarily* infer from what he *does say*, is, that he became the head of the corner since his resurrection, which is cheerfully admitted. But whether it was on the same day, or two, or ten, or forty days after, the apostle saith not. Still your inference would be entirely natural and proper, if it were not contrary to the analogy of faith, and to the teachings of the same spirit in other parts of the Scriptures.

I suppose it will be admitted, that when Christ became the head of the corner, he became "the head over all things to the church," and that then "all things were put under his feet." Now the apostle clearly teaches, that these things took place when he sat down on the right hand of God, as appears from the following texts:—

Ephesians 1: 20—22—"Which he wrought in Christ, when

he raised him from the dead, (or, having raised him from the dead,) and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come : and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church."

Hebrews 2 : 8, 9—" But now we see not yet all things put under him (man;) but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor." Observe, that the Apostle's great object in this epistle is, to show that Christ is *in heaven*, forever interceding for the church.

Now, is it not manifest from these texts, that Christ became the head of the corner when he ascended to his Father and our Father, to his God and our God? Nor is there any thing in Acts 4 : 10, 11, that contradicts this idea.

Brethren, the glorious building of grace has its foundation, not on earth, where we are pilgrims and strangers, but in heaven, where Jesus, the cornerstone, " elect and precious," sitteth at the right hand of God, and is constantly occupied in gathering from afar the " lively stones " of the glorious edifice. Blessed forever be his holy name !

YOUR THIRD PROOF.

John 20 : 19, 26—" Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." " And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them; then came Jesus; the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you."—See also Luke 24 : 26.

You premise, that the disciples, on the two days referred to above, one of which certainly was, and the other may have been, the first day of the week, had met together for public or social worship, when

Christ appeared to them. Whence you infer, that the first day of the week is the Sabbath.

Now, what you premise *seems* to be a mere assumption, for which there is not a shadow of proof, either in the text or context. No one of the Evangelists says that they met for worship ; nor did they worship, so far as we know, when met together. In regard to the first of those occasions, we are told, that they “were assembled for fear of the Jews ;” and, as to the second, we are simply informed, that they “were within,” which means, probably, that they were *at home* ; for Luke tells us, that, on the day of the ascension, the eleven “abode” in an upper room. Acts 1 : 13.

Again, your inference is not *necessary* ; for the matter may be explained thus : On the day of the resurrection, the eleven, having procured a common lodging-room, “assembled for fear of the Jews ;” and Christ appeared to them before the close of the same day, in order that they, who were to be witnesses of his resurrection, might have ocular demonstration of the fact, that he rose “according to the scriptures.” On the other occasion, “after eight days,” he met them, probably, “as they sat at meat,” (Mark 16 : 14,) because Thomas, who had not seen him since his resurrection, was then with them.

These reasons are surely sufficient to account for his appearing on those occasions. But why demand reasons at all ? Had he not a right to meet his disciples on any day of the week that he chose, without telling us why ? Can you tell us why he appeared to the brethren when they were fishing ? Christ has done many things for which the only reason we can give is, that it seemed good to him.

YOUR FOURTH PROOF.

Acts 2 : 1—“And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.”

Your premises are—1. That the Feast of Pentecost fell that year on the first day of the week. 2. That the disciples were, *for that reason*, with one accord in one place.” Whence you infer, that the first day of the week is the Sabbath. I reply—

Whether the Feast of Pentecost fell that year on the first day of the week, or not, the disciples did not meet to keep the Sabbath, but to celebrate Pentecost. They would have been, in like manner “with one accord in one place,” if it had been the fourth day of the week, because it was the day of Pentecost. Therefore, your inference is not only *unnecessary*, but wholly inadmissible.

YOUR FIFTH PROOF.

Acts 20: 7—“And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.”

You premise, that the disciples came together, in this instance, to celebrate the Lord’s Supper, and to hear the word. Whence you infer, that the first day of the week is the Sabbath.

What you premise is very uncertain; for—

1. There is no evidence that they met to hear the word. The object of the meeting was “to break bread;” and the preaching of Paul seems to have been *incidental*, and not by appointment.

2. It is not certain that “to break bread” means to partake of the Lord’s Supper. The Greek word, translated, *to break*, is used very often in the New Testament in reference to ordinary meals. An instance occurs in Luke 24: 35—“And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them *in breaking of bread*.”

But if what you assert were true, your inference is *not necessary*; for—

1. It is entirely proper, for aught we know to the

contrary, to celebrate the Lord's Supper and hear preaching on any day of the week.

2. Perhaps this meeting was held at that particular time, because the Apostle and his company were "ready to depart on the morrow." It was probably a farewell meeting, as many learned men think, and the text itself *seems* to hint.

3. There is not one word said in the text about Sabbath-keeping; nor is there the least intimation, either in the text or context, that the disciples were *accustomed* to meet on the first day of the week for any purpose whatever.

But you say, Paul waited there seven days, and we have no account of his preaching till the last night of his stay, which was the first of the week. We reply, This is no evidence that he did not preach during the other six days. Luke tells us, in this same chapter, verses 2 and 3, that "he came into Greece, and there abode three months;" and he does not say that he preached once during that time. But a small part, indeed, of the doings of the Apostles is recorded.

It is a remarkable fact, that this text, which is the only one in the New Testament that speaks of public religious exercises on the first day of the week, is, at the same time, the only one in the Bible that directly proves, that this day is *not* the Sabbath. I have already proposed to give up the argument in favor of the seventh day, if you produce one apostolic example of unnecessary labor performed therein. Will you give up your argument for the first day on the same condition? I believe this verse furnishes such an example.

The text proves nothing for you, if Paul's sermon and the breaking of bread were not on the first day. The sermon was preached between evening and

midnight, and the bread was broken between midnight and break of day, and then Paul set out on his journey. According to the Roman method of computing time, the breaking of bread, at least, was in the morning of the same day in which Paul traveled from Troas to Assos, and thence to Mitylene; and, according to the Jewish method, the sermon, the breaking of bread, and the journey from Troas to Mitylene, were all within the compass of the same "first day of the week." That Luke should follow the unnatural Roman method, is so unlikely as hardly to be supposable. Now, if Paul traveled unnecessarily from Troas to Mitylene, as it seems he did, on the first day of the week, surely that day was not then the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. This text, therefore, *proves positively that the first day is not the Sabbath*, on which account it is of no little value in this controversy.

YOUR SIXTH PROOF.

1 Corinthians 16: 2—"Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come."

Your premises are—1. That the Apostle here commands the Corinthians to make public collections on the first day of the week. 2. That, therefore, public assemblies were accustomed to be held on that day. Whence you infer, that the first day of the week is the Sabbath.

I deny both your premises. The apostle simply orders, that each one of the Corinthian brethren should lay up *at home* some portion of his weekly gains on the first day of the week. The whole question turns upon the meaning of the expression, "by him;" and I marvel greatly how you can imagine that it means "in the collection box of the congregation." Greenfield, in his Lexicon, trans-

lates the Greek term, "*by one's self, i. e. at home.*" Two Latin versions, the Vulgate and that of Castellio, render it, "*apud se,*" with one's self, at home. Three French translations, those of Martin, Osterwald, and De Sacy, "*chez soi,*" at his own house, at home. The German of Luther, "*bei sich selbst,*" by himself, at home. The Dutch, "*by hemselven,*" same as the German. The Italian of Diodati, "*appresso di se,*" in his own presence, at home. The Spanish of Felipe Scio, "*en su casa,*" in his own house. The Portuguese of Ferreira, "*para isso,*" with himself. The Swedish, "*när sig sielf,*" near himself. I know not how much this list of authorities might be swelled, for I have not examined one translation that differs from those quoted above. Now, if your premises are false, your inference is not only *unnecessary*, but wholly inadmissible.

YOUR SEVENTH PROOF

Revelations 1: 10—"I was in the spirit on the Lord's day."

You premise, that the "Lord's day" is the first day of the week. Whence you infer, that the first day of the week is the Sabbath.

You here assume the principal point in dispute, namely, that God has appointed the first day of every week to be kept in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ. Is every Friday the "Lord's day," because he was crucified on Friday? You answer, No. Is every Thursday the "Lord's day," because he ascended on Thursday? You answer, No. So, when you ask, Is every first day of the week the "Lord's day," because he rose on the first day? I answer, No. And is it too much that I should ask you to prove your assumption? I have never yet met with an attempt to prove it.

But, were this even proved, your inference would not be *necessary*. The first day *might* be the "Lord's

day," and yet not the Sabbath. Would the bare mention of this day by the Apostle John, even if it were certain that he referred to the first day of the week, repeal or alter the fourth commandment? Certainly not. But you ask, What day did he mean? I reply, Most probably he meant the seventh, since we know from several scriptures that this *is in fact the Lord's day*. See Nehemiah 9 : 14, and Isaiah 58 : 13. But you ask again, Why did he not say "the Sabbath," if he meant it? I reply by asking you, Why did he not say "the first day," if he meant it?

Brethren, who can say, that, from any or all of the texts commented upon above, the inference is *necessary*, that the first day of the week *is*, and that the seventh *is not, holy*? But this is precisely what *you* infer from them. On the sole authority of these passages, together with that one in which Christ says, that he is "Lord of the Sabbath," you have no hesitation in affirming that the first day of the week is the very Sabbath day spoken of in the fourth commandment, and that the seventh day of the week is *not now* more holy than any other; or, in other words, that the blessing which God put upon it in the beginning, (Gen. 2 : 21,) has been taken from it, and given to another day. What! because "there remaineth a sabbatism to the people of God," therefore the seventh day *must* have ceased to be the Sabbath! Because "we will be glad and rejoice" in "the day which the Lord hath made," therefore the seventh day *must* have ceased to be holy! Because Christ showed himself to his disciples once or twice on the first day of the week, therefore the seventh day *cannot* be the Sabbath! Because the Pentecostal effusion of the Holy Ghost happened on the first day of the week, as is clearly demonstrated by arithmetical calculation, therefore

the seventh day *cannot* claim to be the Sabbath! Because the disciples met *once* "to break bread" on the first day of the week, therefore God *must* have unsanctified the seventh day! Because the Corinthian and Galatian Christians were commanded to "lay by them in store" on the first day of the week, for the relief of the poor saints, therefore the seventh day *can be nothing more* than a working day! Because John was "in the spirit on the Lord's day," therefore the seventh day *cannot* be "the Lord's day," as it used to be! Because Jesus Christ is "Lord of the Sabbath," and has the right to change it, or even to annihilate it, (?) therefore the seventh day *must* have ceased to be a day of rest! O brethren, you dare not say, that any of these inferences flow from the Scriptures as *necessary consequences*. But if they are not *necessary*—if there is any way of avoiding them, without doing violence either to the text or context—how *can* you ask me to believe that the first day *is*, and that the seventh *is not*, holy?

CONCLUSION.

"The Sabbath was made for man." I am a man; therefore, the Sabbath was made for me. God has blessed and sanctified *the seventh day* of the week, and commanded me to keep it holy *for that reason*; therefore, as long as the seventh day continues to be divinely blessed and sanctified, I am bound to keep it holy. But it is nowhere said in the Bible that God has removed the blessing from this day, or that he has unsanctified it. *You* say so, indeed; but you are neither the authors nor the finishers of my

faith ; nor will your unsupported assertion, a thousand times repeated, amount to a divine revelation. If you assert that it is the will of God that I should cease to regard the seventh day as holy, I ask, Where is this revealed ? What Prophet or Apostle has said so, *directly or indirectly* ? It is not enough for you to answer, that the first day has been blessed and sanctified, as a memorial of the work of redemption. That assertion, if it were true, would not prove that the seventh day *is not holy*. No, brethren, your own conscience must tell you, that there is not one syllable in the Bible on which to ground the doctrine that God has *unsanctified* the seventh day of the week.

But one of your ministers has told me, that God did not bless and sanctify any particular day of the week, but only the Sabbath Institution. To this I have only to say, " Let God be true, and every man a liar." The Holy Ghost says, (Gen. 2 : 2,) " And God blessed the *seventh day*, and sanctified it;" and again, (Exod. 20 : 11,) " Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath DAY, and hallowed it." Now, if you assert, with these scriptures staring you in the face, that God never blessed and sanctified any particular day, but only the Sabbath Institution, do you not make God a liar, in order to excuse your own rebellion ? O brethren, I perceive that these texts are an eye-sore to you, and that in your hearts you wish they were out of the Bible. If you loved them you would not flatly contradict them. I appeal to your own consciousness, is it not your great effort, when you take up the fourth commandment, to convince yourselves and others, that God's Spirit *does not mean* what he says, in as plain language as any Sabbatarian could employ ; that is, that 'the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God' And, when you take up these passages in the New Tes-

tament, which have been considered above, do you not labor to convince yourselves, that the same Spirit *does mean* what he *does not say*; that is, that the first day is the Sabbath?

You do not believe that what God says a dozen times, or more, *can* be true; but you are sure, that what he *does not say even once* is infallibly true; and that nothing but stupidity or scepticism would presume to doubt it. When you are told that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and the testimony of God's Spirit, plainly uttered in one dozen passages, together with the uniform practice of the church as long as we can trace the inspired history of the Sabbath, is offered in proof of the assertion, you shut your eyes, and declare that you can see nothing, and that all this proves nothing. But when you tell me, that the first day *is*, and that the seventh *is not*, the Sabbath, and quote, as proof, Acts 20: 7, and a few other passages, not one of which says one word about the Sabbath, or the seventh day, or a day of rest, or holy time, or exercises which are proper only on the Sabbath, you affirm, that you have proved your position beyond all doubt, and that the only reason why I cannot see the evidence is because the vail of Judaism is over my eyes. The moral law says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath;" but you say, "No, the seventh day is not the Sabbath; you do not understand the law; you mistake its meaning." Neither that law, nor any other in the Bible, says, "The first day is the Sabbath." Notwithstanding, you dare to lift up your hands, and swear by the living God, that the first day *is* the Sabbath. But this is not all. Oh! that it were! The Holy Ghost has said, not only in the record that God made on Adam's heart, and in the covenant of works, but also in the written law given at Mount Sinai, and in several other passages of Scrip-

ture, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." But you have repeatedly sworn by the infinite, eternal, and unchangeable Jehovah, that *this assertion is not true*—that the seventh day is *not* the Sabbath of the Lord our God—that it is a common working day. Because I can no longer join you in this heaven-daring oath, you have declared me unworthy of the confidence of a Christian people, and forbidden me to perform any longer the functions of a missionary of the cross. You have told the church, that, having violated my ordination vows, I have forfeited my ministry, and that my seat at the Lord's table is vacant. You have thus flung upon the heedless winds the mad-dog cry of "suspended minister," "covenant-breaker," and "disturber of the church's peace."

But think not, brethren, beloved in the Lord, that the treatment which I have received at your hands shall deter me from proclaiming what I believe to be God's truth, as God may give me utterance. That you wish to do what is right, I do not doubt. That you believe you do God service in thrusting me from your Christian embraces, is evident enough. That many of you love me yet, and pray for me, I can but hope. But that you all sin in not searching the Scriptures daily to see whether these things are so, I do firmly believe.

And now, brethren, I cannot close this treatise without uttering a word of warning to every one of you, which will, I fear, be very generally disregarded by you. Yet "wo is me" if I utter it not! Do not, I beseech you, be angry at any thing I have written, or refuse to hear my parting words because I am a "suspended minister." You have loaded me with reproach, not because I have committed any crime, but because I have plead for the integri-

ty and immutability of the moral law. I am neither a thief, nor a murderer, nor a robber of churches, but I do most firmly believe, that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord my God, and that you, and all others who do not keep it holy, are guilty before God of a gross violation of the moral law. And can I, under those circumstances, regard your reproaches as a legitimate expression of the Divine displeasure? No. That I am really unworthy of the gospel ministry, I confess. That I am not sufficient for these things, I know. But, after having been regularly called to this responsible work, I will not be driven from it, for such a cause. Know then, ye rulers in the house of God, that I am still a minister of Jesus Christ, sent forth to proclaim the terrors of God's law to the rebellious and impenitent, and to promise the grace of the gospel to the penitent and believing. Know also, ye professors of the Christian religion who neglect the sanctification of the seventh day, and especially ye ministers of Jesus who "teach men so," that you make dark what God has made plain; that you pluck out of the hand of God's schoolmaster one of those rods wherewith he would lash the carnal heart; that you hide one of God's candles under a bushel, and compass yourselves about with sparks, and a fire of your own kindling; that you provoke the Holy Spirit, in rejecting his testimony, and teaching for doctrine the commandments of men. Yes, brethren, though my words fall upon your ears as an idle tale that you believe not, I declare to you, in the name of Him whom your doctrine dishonors and your philosophy insults—in the name of that *suspended Minister*, to whom all the ends of the earth shall look for salvation—that, if you repent not, the Holy Ghost will bear witness against you, in the awful day of retribution, that you have refused his words,

and that you have "put darkness for light, and light for darkness!"

Think not that I am your enemy, because I thus speak. Think not that I have no confidence in your piety, because I rebuke you sharply. Think not that I am proud, boastful, and self-confident, because I dare to approach *you*, who are vastly my superiors in knowledge, and remind you of your duty. I would gladly have avoided this public exhibition of my sentiments. Had it been possible to withhold my testimony, you would never have seen these pages. But "necessity is laid upon me." And think not, I beseech you, that I am against the church of our Redeemer, or would hinder her prosperity, because I oppose a human institution which Christians very generally observe. "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy."

